

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 12, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claims 3-5, 14-17, 20-21, 36-45 and 47-54 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 13, 18, 19, 35 and 46. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 6-13, 18-19, 22-35 and 46 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-12, 18, 21-31, 35, 37-41 and 48-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,445,432); rejected claims 2-3, 19-20 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. in view of Shin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,449); and rejected claims 13-17, 32-34 and 42-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. in view of Song (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,602).

These rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display device comprising a combination of elements, for example, thin film transistor . . . having a drain electrode, a color filter . . . having drain contact holes, and a pixel electrode over the color filter in each pixel region . . . each pixel electrode contacting one of the drain electrodes through the drain contact hole, wherein a portion of the pixel electrode in the drain contact hole contacts inner side surfaces of the color filter defining the drain contact hole...

Similarly, claim 18 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 18 recites, for example, a combination of elements, "...each pixel electrode contacting one of the drain electrodes through the drain contact hole, wherein a portion of the pixel electrode in the drain contact hole contacts inner side surfaces of the color filter defining the drain contact hole..."

Claim 35 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 35 recites, for example, a combination of elements, "...wherein the pixel electrode contacts the drain electrode through a drain contact hole of each of the red, green and blue color filters exposing the drain electrode, and wherein a portion of the pixel electrode in the drain contact hole contacts inner side surfaces of each of the red, green and blue color filters defining the drain contact hole..."

Claim 46 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 46 recites, for example, a combination of elements, "...wherein the pixel electrode contacts the drain electrode through a drain contact hole of the color filter exposing the drain electrode, wherein a portion of the pixel electrode in the drain contact hole contacts inner side surfaces of the color filter defining the drain contact hole." None of the cited references teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Further, the Examiner states at page 4 of the Office Action that "a top surface of the color filter substantially has the same level as a top surface of the light-shielding color filter patterns since the top surface of the color filter and light-shielding color filter patterns is the surface of the flattening film 14." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Yamamoto et al. discloses that the flattening film 14 is not the color filter 10 in the pixel region and the light-shielding color filter patterns consisting of the color filters 10 to 12 on the thin film transistor. Rather, the flattening film 14 is a component completely different from the color layer 10 in the pixel region and the light-shielding color filter patterns, and the flattening film 14 is on the top surface of the color layer 10 and over the top surface of the light-shielding color filter patterns. Applicant does not understand the Examiner's reasoning. The Examiner notes that the claimed invention recites "a top surface of the color filter substantially has the same level as a top surface of the light-shielding color filter patterns" and never recites a top surface of a flattening layer on the color filter has the same level as the top surface of a flattening layer over the light-shielding color filter patterns.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 6-13, claim 18 and its dependent claims 19 and 22-34, claim 35, and claim 46 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing discussion places the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 11, 2008

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./

Gustavo Siller, Jr., Reg. No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200